DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 831 HE 001 117

By-Sandness, Wesley James

Data Gathering for Decision Making by Presidents of State Colleges and Universities.

Kansas State Coll. of Pittsburg.

Pub Date May 69

Note-57p.; Paper submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the Academic Administration Internship Program of the American Council on Education

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.95

Descriptors-Administration, *Administrative Policy, Data, *Decision Making, *Higher Education, *Institutional Research, *Presidents, State Colleges, State Universities

Under the stress of today's extremely complex and diverse pressures, "college administrators have been abandoning institutions of higher education like rats from a sinking ship." College presidents need to be able to obtain significant information about their institutions in order to make decisions sufficiently viable for the institution's survival. This study assessed some of the kinds and sources of data used in the decision making of college presidents under present conditions. Presidents of institutions belonging to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities were queried on: which officers have the responsibility for providing the president with data such as studies on students, budget and curriculum, long range planning, space utilization, and federal programs; what kinds of institutional data in these areas do they regularly review in making decisions; how does the president decide where to gather information in making policy decisions; does the president communicate research findings to the faculty; and what was the value of ongoing studies compared with those completed when a problem arose. The results, analyzed in this paper, show no standard set or recommended pattern of behavior. It was found, however, that presidents seem preoccupied with providing physical facilities and budgetary efficiency. (JS)

ED0 32831

DATA GATHERING FOR DECISION MAKING BY PRESIDENTS OF STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

BY

WESLEY JAMES SANDNESS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 001 117

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Academic Administration Internship Program
of the American Council on Education
May, 1969

ACHNOWLEDGMENT

Gratitude is expressed to Dr. George F. Budd, President of Kansas State College of Pittsburg and President of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, without whose assistance this study would not have been possible.

W. J. S.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	PURPOSE AND PROCEDURES	7
III.	THE DATA	10
	The Sources of Decision Making Information for Presidential Use	10
	Kinds of Data Used by Presidents in Decision Making	13
	Student Studies	14
	Budget Analysis	16
	Academic and Curriculum Analysis	17
	Space Utilization Analysis	18
	Faculty Load	19
	Summary of Data Sources	20
	Communication of Available Information to the Campus Community	22
IV.	SOME FINAL THOUGHTS	24
V.	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY	28
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	29
	APPENDIX	31
	Appendix A: Questionnaire Results	32
	Appendix B: Cover Letter	57

INTRODUCTION

It is an obvious fact that there is considerable unrest in higher education today; unrest which is not only generated by student concern, but also can certainly be found around and among the top administrators. Last year the headlines indicated over 300 vacancies for college and university presidents. Many resigned claiming "presidential fatigue". Others resigned without public comment. The source of the problem is not difficult to determine since other headlines are constantly relating to higher education, drawing attention to student unrest, faculty discontent, tax payer disenchantment, and general alarm among the various "publics" which a university president must face. These problems no doubt arise as a result not only of the burgeoning enrollments and the increasing educational demands upon the students, but also because of the national political mood generated by racial problems, war, military service or the draft, and increased national communication.

The complexity of the modern day university has in most cases only served to increase the difficulty for a college administrator in meeting the obligations of his position. Apparently, the responsibilities of the college presidency exert enough demand on an individual's energy reserve that those who now hold these jobs will not continue in them for the rest of their working career or,

for that matter, for very much longer. As an example, in a recent report published in the Memo to the President from the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, from a survey for TIAA-CREF, the author states that although the typical college president is more than ten years away from the normal retirement age of 65, he will probably hold his position as president for only three or four more years. Of those who did resign and who did take other jobs, most were in positions completely outside of University life.[1]

Part of the problem is perhaps centered around the decision making processes of institutions of higher education. A recent comment in Education Age magazine by Fred C. Manassee is a startling example of what critics are saying, "If the Ford Motor Company were managed along the same principles as schools, a Ford would cost $100,000 . . . and all workers would need college degrees." His implication was not that the educators are necessarily incompetent, but that the structure is wrong. The alternative to exercising restraints and economies in education has always been available at least in the public sector -- that of raising taxes.[2]

---

[1] American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Memo to the President, Edited by Jane Otten, 9:5, April 23, 1969: p.4.

[2] Fred C. Manasse, "If Ford Were Run Like the Schools", Education Age, 5:4, March-April, 1969: p.36.

Furthermore, the milieu of an institution where the search for knowledge and truth is made, based on the concept of academic freedom especially as it is interpreted today with the commensurate right to teach and to learn, has done little to allow management flexibility in administering this leviathan called higher education. In this kind of organization contrary to that found in industry, the controlling policies are generated and the kinds of products produced are determined not so much by the top management, but by those down in the ranks. In industry, there is an easier assessment of quality control based on concrete information and a more precise determination of what products shall be produced. But in higher education there exists a coveted guarding of the right to search for knowledge in whatever direction that search might lead. The justification for time, money, and materials is in many cases taken for granted without any promise of guaranteed results. This is not to be taken as a suggestion for change or an indictment against the concept of academic freedom, but rather to simply state that the situation is an educational fact of life with which administrators of higher educational institutions must constantly reckon.

The problem actually has been compounded over the years. When higher education began in the United States with the founding of Harvard in the 17th century and with the subsequent

founding of other similar colleges, not only were the schools a good deal smaller making them easier to manage, but the authority of the administration to direct was much more apparent and tangible. In these early schools the curriculum was relatively simple and the question of academic freedom, especially for students, was nonexistent.

In fact, the early colleges were perhaps considerably irrelevant to society and apparently produced a conspicuously minor impact on the character of the developing nation at that time. Those who attended institutions of higher education in the early colonies were in the extreme minority and their purposes for doing so were largely disassociated with the intellectual and social development of the era.[3]

The transition from the type of institution common to those days down to the present was not without difficulty. In fact, the involution of the decision making process has continuously increased and has never been so great as it is today. The demands of an increasing technology for occupationally trained as well as liberally educated individuals; the influence of the German universities on graduate education, research, and academic freedom; the concept of an educated and informed con-

---

[3] Christopher Jencks & David Riesman, The Academic Revolution, Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1968: p.1.

stituency in a democracy; and the practical needs of a complex society have all created demands upon higher education to an extent that today's university is the servant of many masters.

The most striking impact of change and complexity which generated today's difficulties in administering higher education, though not unrelated to the long evolution of higher education in this country, has come following World War II. Mass education, population growth, industrial and technological expansion, and the explosion of available knowledge and information have changed the character of the situation decidedly. Higher educational institutions are no longer small. They are no longer even approaching anything that might be termed simple. They are complex, diverse, and multi-purpose. This is in itself not news, but the result of these changes have been vexing to almost everyone associated with higher education. Gone are the days when faculty sat under the shade of a maple tree sipping a mint julip while the student body practiced their loyalty chants for the next athletic contest (if indeed this ever happened).

A more typical picture of a modern campus today is the busy atmosphere of a large and active industry with complex laboratories and classrooms equipped with complicated gear where faculty and students are engaged in the pursuit of their individual endeavors, not necessarily relating to the stereotyped

version of the beloved halls of ivy. In fact, the so-called teaching-learning process has given way in some cases to demands of research contracts, governmentally funded service programs, and private faculty endeavors tending to fragment the purposes of higher education ad infinitum.

Yet, with all this change, the basic structure of the decision making organization has remained with the mint julip boys, causing a backlash among faculty and especially students that is presently reverberating from one end of the nation to the other. This is a considerable assertion which, if necessary, can be documented at length. Suffice it to be said at this point that because this is true, college administrators have been abandoning institutions of higher education like rats from a sinking ship.

Yet the serious fact remains that for those who now hold positions of responsibility in college administration, and specifically college presidents, there must be a means of obtaining perspicuous information about their complex institutions for making sufficiently viable decisions for the institution to continue to function under the stress of extremely diverse demands. The obvious question, then, is: "What are these kinds of information and how are they obtained?"

PURPOSE AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this undertaking, therefore, was to assess some of the kinds and sources of data used in the decision making of the college president under the conditions previously described.

The institutions selected were those belonging to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, which are among the fastest growing colleges and universities in the United States. These schools now enroll more than one-fourth of the total four-year college and university student population. It has been estimated that by 1975, this group of institutions will enroll more than one-third of the four-year college enrollees.[4] The size of the institutions range from less than 500 students to just under 30,000, with an average size of around 6,500. They are represented in 44 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. They are located in both rural and urban areas, serving students from all academic and economic backgrounds. The highest level of academic degrees offered is predominantly the Master's degree; however, some offer only the Bachelor's degree, while others offer the Specialist and the Doctorate.

---

[4] Committee on Policies and Purposes, One Out of Five, Association of State Colleges and Universities, Prepared by Dr. Joe Smith, 1967: p.4.

Presidents of the colleges and universities belonging to this association were queried about their practices in organizing and data gathering for decision making. The thrust of the questionnaire presented to them was toward finding their usual practices, and not necessarily what they considered optimum or even desirable. The point was to find out just what they did now.

Of the presidents queried, 135 responded. In most cases the questionnaire was completed personally by the president (73% of those responding), but in 6% of the cases they were filled out by his assistant, 1% by the registrar, 8% by an officer in institutional research, 3% by a dean or vice president, and 4% by some other officer. Five percent did not indicate the person reporting.

These presidents were asked two types of questions:

1. What kinds of information do they personally use in their decision making?

2. Who has the responsibility for making the information available to them?

Since the colleges and universities for which these men served were all publicly supported, it should be recognized that the decisions these presidents make are within that context and are not necessarily the same problems as those faced by presidents of private institutions. For example, their student clientele,

their budgeting process, their long-range planning, and even their curriculum would be organized and processed according to those characteristics peculiar to a publicly supported institution. Therefore, the kinds of data needed to make the necessary judgments would be of that type and for those purposes.

THE DATA

The Sources of Decision Making Information for Presidential Use

The presidents were asked which officers have the responsibility for providing various kinds of data to the president; such as studies dealing with students, budget, curriculum, faculty, long-range planning, space utilization analysis, and federal programs. Normally, it would be expected that the administrator for a particular area would report on his affairs directly to the president. However, there was no real pattern among the institutions, other than to say that the administrator in charge of the particular area only sometimes had the responsibility of providing the information about his area to the president.

For example, the individual in charge of the division of student affairs normally reported data regarding students to the president. However, in many cases the office of institutional research had that responsibility, among others reported. In 19% of the cases, neither the office of research nor the officer in charge of student affairs reported on students to the president.

The same was true in the area of fiscal matters. Although predominently the individual charged with the administration of fiscal affairs reported this, in 42% of the cases he did not.

In more than one out of four cases, the office of institutional research had that responsibility.

In the area of curriculum, the president most often gathered his information from the person charged with the responsibility for academic affairs. However, in some instances there seemed to be an indication that the president really did not enter into discussions about curriculum until the matters had been settled, and were simply reported to him.[5]

The office most frequently reported as being responsible for preparing data on long-range planning was the office of institutional research. Since only slightly over half the institutions maintain an office of institutional research, apparently the office, when created, is charged normally with this kind of responsibility.

The same can be said of the administering and reporting on federal research programs, of space utilization analysis, and of faculty data. For example, in 36% of the cases the research office had the responsibility for reporting faculty characteristics; while in only 29% did the person charged with the responsibility of administering the academic program, and therefore the faculty, have the responsibility.

---

[5] See Appendix A, p. 55.

The question of space utilization analysis, which commonly must not only be reported to the president, but also to the state coordinating boards in most states and also to the U. S. Office of Education, provided an interesting example of the diversity of organization in institutions, which supposedly are quite similar in structure and background, and may be worth noting at some length.

As indicated earlier, the research office most often reported the space utilization analysis. However, in other cases a facilities program coordinator, the Academic Vice President, the Director of the Physical Plant, the Executive Vice President, the Data Processing office, the Physical Facilities Committee, the Registrar, the Business Manager, the Director of Admissions and Records, the Assistant to the President, the Director of Personnel, and the Dean of Graduate Studies reported the space utilization information. Even after cataloging this rather extensive list of individuals, it was found that an additional 3% indicated someone other than those listed above reported this information; and 11% made no response at all. The responsibility for space analysis was delegated to a greater variety of individuals and positions than was any other item examined.

Kinds of Data Used by Presidents In Decision Making

The presidents were asked what kinds of studies or institutional data were regularly reviewed by them for their decision making responsibilities. Those specifically noted were in the area of student studies, budget analysis, curriculum analysis, faculty characteristics, institutional projections, and space utilization analysis.

In the majority of cases, perhaps an average of more than three out of four presidents indicated that they reviewed personally studies in all of these categories regularly, although it is significant to note the kinds of studies that interested them most in each of these groups. Discussion of those will follow later in this report. Most frequently mentioned for their personal review were budget analysis, student studies, and institutional projections, especially those projections having to do with fiscal affairs and the physical plant. Space utilization analysis also represented a high degree of personal attention by the presidents responding. At the same time, most reported that they must file with the state coordinating board the projections of enrollment, of physical plant, and the budget; while state boards also require that an accounting of the utilization of space be made to them. Apparently the state boards are most interested in the projections of costs for future needs and in finding out whether or not present facilities are being used.

The presidents indicated that they reviewed personally least frequently information about curriculum and faculty studies. These were also indicated to have been reported least frequently to the state coordinating boards.

In addition to those studies used by the presidents reporting which were prepared on the campus, they also found useful certain analysis acquired from off-campus sources, particularly from the state coordinating or governing boards. In no instances did as large a percentage of presidents use studies prepared off-campus as those prepared by someone on their own campus. Those most frequently mentioned as being useful were prepared predominantly by the state coordinating or governing board and dealt with enrollment, space utilization, or faculty salary studies. Curriculum and faculty matters other than salaries ranked again as the least used.

Student Studies

A portion of the questionnaire was reserved for questions dealing specifically with the kirds of information needed regarding several areas in which a president would be concerned in making his decisions about students.

When considering students, it appears that presidents are most interested in concrete data such as enrollment and enrollment predictions, full-time student equivalents, residency, number of transfers, class level, first-time enrollments, and matters of this kind. They apparently reviewed less often matters having to do with how students feel or what they are thinking.

For example, 96% of the presidents reporting indicated that they regularly reviewed the head count enrollment of their institution, but less than one out of four (23%) used the results of a campus climate or student environmental survey. In fact, quantitative student data was available and examined on every campus, which is not surprising. But, in over one out of four cases there was apparently not available any indication of data pertaining to student attitudes. Furthermore, although more than half of the presidents reporting indicated they examine scholastic achievement and progress patterns, this was confined most often to standard achievement scores. Distributions of college grades and of high school rank were generally not examined to the extent that were other student information.

Thirteen percent of the presidents reporting said they regularly reviewed student initiated evaluation of instruction and that only 8% use institutionally initiated student evaluations on a regular basis. In almost half the institutions for

which reports were received, there was no student evaluations of instruction available on the campus.

After examining the kinds of information used, it is not surprising that the person most often responsible for reporting student information to the president was the Registrar, in almost three out of four cases. There was an indication that other offices sometimes shared this responsibility, however, including the office of student affairs and a central office of research.

Budget Analysis

Another category set aside for the presidents to indicate the kinds of data they need for decisions in a particular area had to do with budgeting. The kinds of data most often examined dealt with faculty salaries, income from tuition and fees, general operating expenditures, and other income for educational and general purposes.

Most of the presidents were interested in average faculty salaries and, to some degree, fringe benefits. They most often wanted this information by academic rank rather than by level of academic preparation. A relatively smaller number of institutions apparently use unit cost indices for budgeting purposes.

However, the number is very close to half of those reporting who do use these.

As would be expected, the majority of presidents charge the budget officer with the responsibility for reporting fiscal analysis. However, more than one out of four indicated that a central office of research also has this responsibility.

Academic and Curriculum Analysis

Although it may be argued that every area for which a president may desire information was not included in this questionnaire (which would be a valid argument), a certain number of areas were examined to find the extent to which presidents found academic and curriculum studies useful in making their decisions. The degree to which presidents found useful the kinds of information stated in the questionnaire in this category was somewhat less significant tothem than in other areas, such as was found in budgeting for example. Only one or two exceptions to this were found, such as the number of students completing degrees and the kinds of degrees being granted. A majority were interested in the number of clock hours taught and student credit hours taught. Half wanted to know the number of students placed on academic probation.

In this area more than any other it was indicated that much of the information was available but seldom used. There was an indication that most often the Registrar and the Academic Vice President shared the responsibility for providing these data to the President.

Space Utilization Analysis

It could be said that one measure of the efficiency of an industry would be the extent to which the facilities available were being utilized in the production of the product. If this assumption were being carried over into higher education, then it would also be important to know the degree to which the physical facilities of the campus were being utilized toward the education of the students enrolled. Carrying the assumption further, it would seem fitting that a manager of an industry would need to evaluate the utilization of his facilities in order to arrive at some determination of his efficiency and, therefore, have some idea of possible economies in his operation.

About half of the presidents reporting regularly used infomation about classroom utilization either weekly or by the hour. More than three out of four, however, had some indication of the percentage of student station utilization. Nearly half used

some sort of space utilization formula or index to determine whether or not the facilities were being used to whatever might be their capacity.

More often, it seemed that state coordinating boards or governing boards assumed the responsibility of examining the utilization of the space and, therefore, determined to some extent the addition of new facilities. It seems important to the president, therefore, that the data be gathered and be forwarded to the appropriate persons responsible, either at the state level or the national level, and that only in particular instances was a president concerned with examining the utilization of his own facilities outside of the context developed through a state plan.

Faculty Load

In this category the president seemed most interested in the quantity of instruction done by the faculty. In other words, they were interested in the average instructional credit hour load and in the amount of other duties such as administrative duties and committee work the faculty did.

It seemed less important to the presidents to know how much research the faculty members were doing or the amount of outside

teaching, extension teaching, or what professional services they were performing. Most, however, indicated that they had instructional quality evaluations, but only half indicated that they reviewed the results of these evaluations. Most did not respond when asked who did then in fact review them, if they did not. Fifty-four percent indicated that the evaluations were used for purposes of determining salary increases. Fifteen percent said they were not, and 31% did not respond. Faculty studies, according to this question, are most often conducted by the academic administration, with other various offices reported as responsible for this to a lesser degree.

Summary of Data Sources

When asked how a president decides where to gather his information in making policy decisions, he responded in a number of ways. For example, when asked what information he used in making determinations about faculty load on the campus, in slightly more than one out of four cases he indicated that he took the recommendation of his academic officer. In almost one out of five cases, he indicated that this was determined for him by state formula. In almost one out of six cases, this was determined as a result of some type of faculty load studies prepared for this purpose.

When the presidents were asked how they received information in making curricular decisions, the most often mentioned source of data was from a faculty committee recommendation. Other sources of information were from the recommendation of the academic administration, departmental recommendation, analysis of research data, and from the recommendation of the Faculty Senate. Some indicated that curriculum was controlled by the state and in others that occupational demands required that certain decisions be made.

The presidents were queried about the source of their information in making decisions for additional instructional facilities or space. One out of four received this information and recommendation from the academic administration, such as the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Instruction, or some similar individual. Fifteen percent depended upon a state-wide planning formula, while almost one out of five actually used the space utilization data as it was collected. This is not to say that the recommendations of the other individuals which came to the president had not been the result of an examination of the space utilization data.

To a large extent, the decision to allocate faculty positions to various departments was made by the recommendation of the academic administration. However, 30% indicated that they made some use of faculty load studies in their decisions regarding this question.

Communication of Available Information To the Campus Community

After having reviewed the research data provided to them, the question was asked of the presidents whether or not they communicate the results of this information to their faculty. In the area of budget information, 31% indicated that they regularly communicate the results of this information to the faculty, while over half indicated they did this occasionally. Eleven percent have not recently done this, at least within the last three years. Five percent did not indicate whether or not they did this at all.

Student studies were either regularly or occasionally distributed to the faculty. Only two respondents indicated that they had not done this recently, while 8% did not say.

The most frequently mentioned category of studies communicated to the faculty on a regular basis were those having to do with curriculum. Those having to do with faculty data were next in rank. Sixty-one percent regularly communicate data on curriculum to the faculty. Thirty percent do this occasionally, while 4% have not done this recently. Forty-five percent regularly communicate information on faculty characteristics to the faculty, while 44% do this occasionally. A similar number of

presidents also report regularly on long-range plans for the institution, although a slightly larger percentage have not reported long-range plans.

A final question was asked the presidents, to determine their opinion about the real value of ongoing studies as opposed to those completed whenever a particular problem arises. Their comments, although extensive in some cases, could be divided into about three categories. In general, the responses indicated that it would depend upon the situation; however, twenty-one percent indicated that they generally prefer the regular ongoing studies. Twenty-three percent selected a particular study for a particular problem; while 33% indicated they preferred them both.

SOME FINAL THOUGHTS

There cannot be found from this study a standard set or recommended pattern of behavior for administrators in gathering the necessary data prior to making a decision. Apparently, every president must find his own unique method in organizing information. No doubt every president is a product of his previous experience; and over a period of time by a combination of trial and error, he becomes familiar with techniques which work for him, gathering as he goes along suggestions for changing his behavior in order to improve his ability to function in his position.

It is also true that in addition to having no set patterns for data gathering, there is also no specific individual who has responsibility for reporting a particular function to the president. For example, those in charge of physical facilities or student affairs may only work in that area and at the same time may not have the responsibility for providing the president with definitive information about their work on a regular basis. Although many do have this responsibility, a surprisingly large number do not. It seems in these cases that the president must find methods of gathering these data for himself, sometimes in spite of the fact that his second level administrators have the information almost within their grasp.

A second important finding resulting from this survey was a reaffirmation of the often stated thesis that there is a great diversity in higher educational organization. Not only does a president have difficulty in finding data for his own decision making, the organizational structure to which these decisions are implemented are also extremely diverse. Each campus seems to be the result of an evolution that is distinctly unique for it and is influenced as it progresses along by those who come and go in faculty and administrative positions, while at the same time retaining a flavor of its uniqueness.

A third discovery in this study was that the responsibility of a president seems to center around a preoccupation with providing physical facilities and budgetary efficiency. He gathered information less often having to do with the ideas and feelings of the faculty and students. They were important professionally only in those instances where they affected the physical structure of the institution. Apparently, no regularly established structure existed in many cases for gathering these data. Perhaps this lack of structure precipitated the recent comments by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Finch, "Higher education has become regid, encrusted, and has not been responsive."[6]

---

[6] American Council on Education, Higher Education and National Affairs, The Council, Washington, D. C. XVIII:16, May 9, 1969: p.1.

There could also be considerable conjecture about the reasons for some presidents' apparent inability to grasp the meaning behind much of the recent campus turmoil which may relate to the insufficiency indicated above. The comments by James E. Allen, Jr., as he was sworn in as U. S. Commissioner of Education, are revealing and have close ties with the finding that presidents have no commonly existing structure for gathering student attitudes. Commissioner Allen said:

> I think very definitely that, in many cases, as a matter of fact in most cases, what college and university presidents are trying to do is to understand the issues that are involved, the concerns that are expressed by the students, and come to grips with those, along with the efforts they are trying to make to deal with those that get out of hand or violate the law or violate university rules.[7]

It is possible that an existing structure for gathering data on student attitudes before the present crisis arose would have been helpful to curb some of the explosive nature of campus disorder.

Perhaps the preoccupation of the president for providing physical facilities and budgetary efficiency is good to some degree. It could possibly be, as some have contended, that the president's responsibility really is to provide and maintain a place for education to thrive, where others can satisfactorily do their work. If this is done well, then the questions involv-

---

[7] Ibid., p. 1.

ing the educational processes working within these facilities can more properly be left to those whose principal responsibility is in this area. The question remains, however, that if the responsibility for educational process is not the major burden of the president and is in fact delegated to other individuals, will they also be responsive to the task of listening to the human needs of those involved within this structure?

Perhaps the president is a liaison officer, working between the academic institution on the one hand and the more external institutions on the other, such as the governing board which provides necessary support in order that the academic institution can thrive. This accounts to some degree for his preoccupation with physical and financial matters. Because it has generally been true that the role of the governing board is to provide the facilities and general framework for the institution, and because it is generally accepted that the board should not normally engage in questions other than those dealing with general policies, the administration of the institution has been delegated to those actually working on the campus, specifically delegated through the president. Whoever then accepts the delegation of the task from the president for education the young people enrolled in institutions of higher education apparently must also develop the flexibility to adjust to the changing demands made upon colleges and universities in these changing times.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The written report contained above is a very cursory analysis of the data available from the questionnaire returned. Additional study must be made, and is possible from the data already obtained, before further results can be determined, such as:

1. What size is an institution in its growth pattern before decision making patterns change?

2. Of the institutions who maintain a research office for gathering institutional data, what are the general responsibilities of this office as opposed to the regular reporting channels to the president?

3. What are the characteristics of the institutions whose presidents now gather data about student attitudes and behavior as opposed to those who do not?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Memo to the President, Edited by Jane Otten, 9:5, April 23, 1969, 12 pp.

American Council on Education, Higher Education and National Affairs, The Council, Washington, D. C., XVIII:16, May 9, 1969: 8pp.

Committee on Policies and Purposes, One Out of Five, Association of State Colleges and Universities, Prepared by Dr. Joe Smith, 1967: 9 pp.

Jencks, Christopher and David Riesman, The Academic Revolution, Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1968: 580 pp.

Manasse, Fred C., "If Ford Were Run Like the Schools", Education Age, 5:4, March-April, 1969: pp 36-39.

APPENDIX

Appendix A

Questionnaire Results

Title of Person Completing this Questionnaire:

President	98	73%
Assistant to President	8	6%
Registrar	1	1%
Institutional Research	11	8%
Dean or Vice President	4	3%
Other	6	4%
No Response	7	5%

1. Head Count Enrollment of Your Institution:

1 to 499	4	3%
500 to 999	3	2%
1000 to 1999	23	17%
2000 to 2999	17	13%
3000 to 3999	18	13%
4000 to 4999	17	13%
5000 to 5999	9	7%
6000 to 6999	7	5%
7000 to 7999	8	6%
8000 to 8999	4	3%
9000 to 9999	7	5%
10000 to 14999	11	8%
15000 to 19999	3	2%
20000 or Over	4	3%

2. Level of Degrees Offered:

B.S.	26	19%
M.S.	77	57%
Specialist	22	16%
Ed.D. or Ph.D.	10	8%

3. Do you have a Central Institutional Research Office at your School?

Yes	76	56%
No	59	44%

In what Year was it established?

1935	2	3%
1957	2	3%
1960	1	1%
1961	1	1%
1962	5	6%
1963	3	4%
1964	3	4%
1965	12	16%
1966	15	20%
1967	15	20%
1968	11	14%
1969	2	3%
None	4	5%

4. Indicate what office has responsibility in the following areas:

A. Student Studies:

Research Office	49	36%
Dean of Students (Student Services)	35	26%
Other	25	19%
No Response	26	19%

B. Budget Analysis:

Research Office	16	26%
Business Office	72	53%
Other	12	9%
No Response	35	26%

C. Curriculum Analysis:

Research Office	25	19%
Dean of College, Academic Dean or Academic V.P.	58	43%
Other	19	14%
No Response	33	24%

D. Faculty Characteristics Analysis:

Research Office	48	36%
Dean of College, Academic Dean or Academic V.P.	39	29%
Other	11	8%
No Response	27	27%

E. Computer Center or Central Data Systems:

Research Office	18	13%
Computer Center, etc.	31	23%
Other	34	25%
No Response	52	39%

F. Long-Range Planning:

Research Office	36	27%
President	25	19%
Vice President for Planning	17	13%
Other	28	21%
No Response	29	22%

G. Space Utilization Analysis:

Research Office	43	32%
Academic Dean or Academic Vice President	18	13%
President	3	2%
Budget Office (Business Office)	11	8%
Other	32	24%
No Response	28	21%

H. Federal Programs:

Research Office	36	27%
Vice President for Planning	23	17%
President	3	2%
Other	36	27%
No Response	37	27%

5. Which of the following categories are studies completed regularly to be reviewed by you and in which categories are they prepared simply because of some outside request:

A. Student Studies:

Prepared for Your Review	115	85%
Prepared for Your State Coordinating Board	69	51%
Prepared for U. S. Office of Education	69	51%
Other	15	11%
No Response	5	4%

B. Budget Analysis:

Prepared for Your Review	111	82%
Prepared for Your State Coordinating Board	97	72%
Prepared for U. S. Office of Education	31	23%
Other	14	10%
No Response	7	5%

C. Curriculum Analysis:

Prepared for Your Review	106	79%
Prepared for Your State Coordinating Board	63	47%
Prepared for U. S. Office of Education	12	9%
Other	13	10%
No Response	14	10%

D. Faculty Characteristics:

Prepared for Your Review	96	71%
Prepared for Your State Coordinating Board	45	33%
Prepared for U.S. Office of Education	27	20%
Other	18	13%
No Response	27	20%

E. Institutional Projections:

1. Enrollment:

Prepared for Your Review	118	87%
Prepared for Your State Coordinating Board	116	86%
Prepared for U. S. Office of Education	81	60%
Other	18	13%
No Response	3	2%

2. Physical Plant:

Prepared for Your Review	111	82%
Prepared for Your State Coordinating Board	114	84%
Prepared for U. S. Office of Education	61	45%
Other	18	13%
No Response	4	3%

3. Fiscal Projections:

Prepared for Your Review	113	84%
Prepared for Your State Coordinating Board	102	76%
Prepared for U. S. Office of Education	55	41%
Other	18	13%
No Response	5	4%

F. Space Utilization Analysis:

Prepared for Your Review	112	83%
Prepared for Your State Coordinating Board	113	84%
Prepared for U. S. Office of Education	47	35%
Other	19	14%
No Response	4	3%

6. Do you use studies completed by your State Coordinating Board or other off-campus studies in addition to locally prepared studies?

Yes	113	84%
No	7	5%
No Response	15	11%

If yes, with what do they deal?

A. Enrollment Projections:

Prepared by State Board	85	63%
Other than State Board	27	20%
No Response	29	22%

B. Budget Analysis

Prepared by State Board	66	49%
Other than State Board	15	11%
No Response	52	39%

C. Curriculum Analysis:

Prepared by State Board	40	30%
Other than State Board	11	8%
No Response	79	59%

D. Faculty Salary Studies:

Prepared by State Board	78	58%
Other than State Board	42	31%
No Response	23	17%

E. Faculty Characteristics Analysis:

Prepared by State Board	28	21%
Other than State Board	23	17%
No Response	81	60%

F. Space Utilization Analysis:

Prepared by State Board	91	67%
Other than State Board	24	18%
No Response	25	19%

Item I: Student Studies. Check the appropriate blank under each heading below after that type of data analysis with which you are familiar at your institution.

1. Campus Climate or Student Environmental Survey:

Used Regularly by You	31	23%
Not Available on Campus	38	28%
Used on Special Occasions	47	35%
Available but Seldom Used	4	3%
No Response	20	15%

2. Enrollment Analysis by:

A. Head Count:

Used Regularly by You	130	96%
Not Available on Campus	0	0%
Used on Special Occasions	7	5%
Available but Seldom Used	2	1%
No Response	1	1%

B. FTE:

Used Regularly by You	122	90%
Not Available on Campus	0	0%
Used on Special Occasions	7	5%
Available but Seldom Used	1	1%
No Response	8	6%

C. Enrollment by Sex:

Used Regularly by You	98	73%
Not Available on Campus	1	1%
Used on Special Occasions	21	16%
Available but Seldom Used	8	6%
No Response	9	7%

D. Residence:

Used Regularly by You	108	80%
Not Available on Campus	0	0%
Used on Special Occasions	21	16%
Available but Seldom Used	5	4%
No Response	5	4%

E. Department:

Used Regularly by You	97	72%
Not Available on Campus	2	1%
Used on Special Occasions	22	16%
Available but Seldom Used	8	6%
No Response	8	6%

F. Full-time or Part-time:

Used Regularly by You	114	84%
Not Available on Campus	0	0%
Used on Special Occasions	13	10%
Available but Seldom Used	5	4%
No Response	5	4%

G. Evening - Day:

Used Regularly by You	87	64%
Not Available on Campus	7	5%
Used on Special Occasions	21	16%
Available but Seldom Used	10	7%
No Response	14	10%

H. First-time Enrollments:

Used Regularly by You	104	77%
Not Available on Campus	2	1%
Used on Special Occasions	19	14%
Available but Seldom Used	9	7%
No Response	3	2%

I. Transfers:

Used Regularly by You	105	78%
Not Available on Campus	0	0%
Used on Special Occasions	21	16%
Available but Seldom Used	7	5%
No Response	3	2%

J. Class Level

Used Regularly by You	103	76%
Not Available on Campus	1	1%
Used on Special Occasions	17	13%
Available but Seldom Used	10	7%
No Response	5	4%

K. Marital Status:

Used Regularly by You	68	50%
Not Available on Campus	5	4%
Used on Special Occasions	30	22%
Available but Seldom Used	25	19%
No Response	8	6%

3. Scholastic Achievement and Progress Patterns:

A. Averages or Distributions of Standard Achievement Scores:

Used Regularly by You	72	53%
Not Available on Campus	9	7%
Used on Special Occasions	40	30%
Available but Seldom Used	17	13%
No Response	2	2%

B. Averages or Distributions of High School Rank:

Used Regularly by You	64	47%
Not Available on Campus	9	7%
Used on Special Occasions	41	30%
Available but Seldom Used	22	16%
No Response	5	4%

C. Averages or Distributions of College Grades by:

(1) Major:

Used Regularly by You	49	36%
Not Available on Campus	18	13%
Used on Special Occasions	40	30%
Available but Seldom Used	18	13%
No Response	12	9%

(2) Department:

Used Regularly by You	52	39%
Not Available on Campus	15	11%
Used on Special Occasions	43	32%
Available but Seldom Used	15	11%
No Response	11	8%

(3) School or College:

Used Regularly by You	36	27%
Not Available on Campus	16	12%
Used on Special Occasions	37	27%
Available but Seldom Used	18	13%
No Response	29	22%

(4) Total College:

Used Regularly by You	73	54%
Not Available on Campus	6	4%
Used on Special Occasions	38	28%
Available but Seldom Used	17	13%
No Response	6	4%

4. Student Evaluation of Instructors:

A. Student Initiated Evaluation of Faculty:

Used Regularly by You	17	13%
Not Available on Campus	57	42%
Used on Special Occasions	29	22%
Available but Seldom Used	13	10%
No Response	21	16%

B. Institutionally Initiated Student Evaluations of Faculty:

Used Regularly by You	11	8%
Not Available on Campus	64	47%
Used on Special Occasions	27	20%
Available but Seldom Used	7	5%
No Response	27	20%

Are the Studies Dealing with Students Prepared by:

Central office of Research	51	28%
The Registrar	96	71%
The Student Services	80	59%
Other	40	30%

Item II: Budget Analysis. Check the appropriate blank under each heading below after that type of data analysis with which you are familiar at your institution:

1. Total Salaries of Faculty:

A. Average Salary:

Used Regularly by You	117	87%
Not Available on Campus	0	0%
Used on Special Occasions	16	12%
Available but Seldom Used	7	5%
No Response	1	1%

B. Fringe Benefits:

Used Regularly by You	104	77%
Not Available on Campus	0	0%
Used on Special Occasions	22	16%
Available but Seldom Used	7	5%
No Response	8	6%

C. Average Salary by Rank:

Used Regularly by You	116	86%
Not Available on Campus	0	0%
Used on Special Occasions	15	11%
Available but Seldom Used	8	6%
No Response	1	1%

D. Average Salary by Level of Academic Preparation:

Used Regularly by You	70	52%
Not Available on Campus	18	13%
Used on Special Occasions	22	16%
Available but Seldom Used	17	13%
No Response	12	9%

2. Total Income from Tuition and Fees:

Used Regularly by You	106	79%
Not Available on Campus	1	1%
Used on Special Occasions	15	11%
Available but Seldom Used	13	10%
No Response	4	3%

3. Total Operating Expenditures for Education and General Purposes:

Used Regularly by You	128	95%
Not Available on Campus	0	0%
Used on Special Occasions	8	6%
Available but Seldom Used	2	1%
No Response	1	1%

4. Other Income for Education and General Purposes:

Used Regularly by You	115	85%
Not Available on Campus	1	1%
Used on Special Occasions	10	7%
Available but Seldom Used	5	4%
No Response	7	5%

5. Unit Cost Indices:

Used Regularly by You	63	47%
Not Available on Campus	26	19%
Used on Special Occasions	25	19%
Available but Seldom Used	6	4%
No Response	17	13%

Are the Fiscal Studies Completed by:

A Budget Officer	125	93%
Central Office of Research	35	26%
Other	20	15%
No Response	1	1%

Item III: Academic & Curricular Analysis. Check the appropriate blank under each heading below after that type of data analysis with which you are familiar at your institution:

1. Transcript Analysis:

A. Students completing all Course Work at Your Institution:

Used Regularly by You	43	32%
Not Available on Campus	17	13%
Used on Special Occasions	37	27%
Available but Seldom Used	35	26%
No Response	5	4%

B. Transfers Completing Degrees:

Used Regularly by You	24	18%
Not Available on Campus	20	15%
Used on Special Occasions	49	36%
Available but Seldom Used	37	27%
No Response	7	5%

C. Total Completing Degrees:

Used Regularly by You	103	76%
Not Available on Campus	4	3%
Used on Special Occasions	17	13%
Available but Seldom Used	12	9%
No Response	3	2%

D. Number of BS, MS, & PhD:

Used Regularly by You	106	79%
Not Available on Campus	2	1%
Used on Special Occasions	22	16%
Available but Seldom Used	5	4%
No Response	3	2%

E. Number of Degrees by Department:

Used Regularly by You	75	56%
Not Available on Campus	5	4%
Used on Special Occasions	32	24%
Available but Seldom Used	22	16%
No Response	4	3%

F. Students Taking All Requirements:

Used Regularly by You	30	22%
Not Available on Campus	21	16%
Used on Special Occasions	39	29%
Available but Seldom Used	35	26%

G. Waiving Some Required Courses:

Used Regularly by You	10	7%
Not Available on Campus	34	25%
Used on Special Occasions	27	27%
Available but Seldom Used	40	30%
No Response	14	10%

H. Substituting Other Courses:

Used Regularly by You	13	10%
Not Available on Campus	33	24%
Used on Special Occasions	36	27%
Available but Seldom Used	38	28%
No Response	15	11%

I. Terms Attended to Achieve Graduation:

Used Regularly by You	25	19%
Not Available on Campus	26	19%
Used on Special Occasions	36	27%
Available but Seldom Used	40	30%

J. Repetition of Courses:

Used Regularly by You	14	10%
Not Available on Campus	31	23%
Used on Special Occasions	39	29%
Available but Seldom Used	38	28%
No Response	13	10%

K. Probation:

Used Regularly by You	68	50%
Not Available on Campus	5	4%
Used on Special Occasions	38	28%
Available but Seldom Used	23	17%
No Response	4	3%

L. Withdrawals:

Used Regularly by You	56	41%
Not Available on Campus	5	4%
Used on Special Occasions	41	30%
Available but Seldom Used	27	20%
No Response	6	4%

2. Student Clock Hours Taught:

Used Regularly by You	81	60%
Not Available on Campus	8	6%
Used on Special Occasions	32	24%
Available but Seldom Used	11	8%
No Response	6	4%

3. Student Credit Hours Taught:

Used Regularly by You	97	72%
Not Available on Campus	3	2%
Used on Special Occasions	29	22%
Available but Seldom Used	8	6%
No Response	1	1%

4. Classes Taken Most Frequently (Or Least Frequently):

Used Regularly by You	34	25%
Not Available on Campus	24	18%
Used on Special Occasions	39	29%
Available but Seldom Used	28	21%
No Response	11	8%

Are the Academic and Curricular Analysis Studies Conducted by:

Research Officer	27	27%
Academic Vice President (or equivalent)	89	66%
Registrar	83	61%
Other	25	19%
No Response	3	2%

Item IV: Space Utilization Analysis. Check the appropriate blank under each heading below after that type of data analysis with which you are familiar at your institution:

1. Utilization Measurements:

A. Percent of Classroom Weekly Utilization:

Used Regularly by You	68	50%
Not Available on Campus	7	5%
Used on Special Occasions	54	40%
Available but Seldom Used	9	7%
No Response	2	1%

B. Percent of Classroom Hourly Utilization:

Used Regularly by You	67	50%
Not Available on Campus	8	6%
Used on Special Occasions	52	39%
Available but Seldom Used	10	7%
No Response	3	2%

C. Percent of Student Station Utilization:

Used Regularly by You	65	48%
Not Available on Campus	9	7%
Used on Special Occasions	51	38%
Available but Seldom Used	13	10%
No Response	3	2%

D. Space Utilization Index:

Used Regularly by You	57	42%
Not Available on Campus	18	13%
Used on Special Occasions	49	36%
Available but Seldom Used	10	7%
No Response	6	4%

E. Space Utilization Analysis by Department:

Used Regularly by You	49	36%
Not Available on Campus	18	13%
Used on Special Occasions	48	36%
Available but Seldom Used	14	10%
No Response	10	7%

2. Space Availability Measurements:

A. Total Gross Assignable Square Feet:

Used Regularly by You	68	50%
Not Available on Campus	5	4%
Used on Special Occasions	47	35%
Available but Seldom Used	17	13%
No Response	1	1%

B. Total Net Assignable Square Feet:

Used Regularly by You	67	50%
Not Available on Campus	5	4%
Used on Special Occasions	48	36%
Available but Seldom Used	17	13%
No Response	1	1%

C. Net Assignable Space by Department:

Used Regularly by You	50	37%
Not Available on Campus	15	11%
Used on Special Occasions	48	36%
Available but Seldom Used	16	12%
No Response	8	6%

D. Net Assignable Space by Function:

Used Regularly by You	57	42%
Not Available on Campus	8	6%
Used on Special Occasions	45	33%
Available but Seldom Used	22	16%
No Response	5	4%

By Whom are Your Space Utilization Analysis Studies Prepared?

Research Office	26	19%
Facilities Program Coor.	21	16%
Academic Vice President (or equivalent)	19	14%
Director of Physical Plant	8	6%
Executive Vice President (or equivalent)	10	7%
Data Processing Office	1	1%
Physical Facilities Comm.	1	1%
Registrar	8	6%
Business Manager	9	7%
Admissions & Records	1	1%
Assistant to President	9	7%
Personnel Director	1	1%
Dean of Graduates	1	1%
Dean of Students	2	1%
Other	3	2%
No Response	15	11%

Item V: Faculty Load Studies. Below are questions about institutional data that may be of use to you. Check the appropriate blank after that type of data analysis with which you are familiar:

1. Faculty Activity:

A. What is the Average Instructional Credit Hour Load?

Used Regularly by You	109	81%
Not Available on Campus	3	2%
Used on Special Occasions	23	17%
Available but Seldom Used	3	2%

B. Who does How Much Departmental Research?

Used Regularly by You	41	30%
Not Available on Campus	32	24%
Used on Special Occasions	36	27%
Available but Seldom Used	17	13%
No Response	9	7%

C. What Faculty Have Administrative Duties?

Used Regularly by You	97	72%
Not Available on Campus	4	3%
Used on Special Occasions	30	22%
Available but Seldom Used	4	3%
No Response	3	2%

D. What Professional Services are Performed?

Used Regularly by You	62	46%
Not Available on Campus	16	12%
Used on Special Occasions	41	30%
Available but Seldom Used	13	10%
No Response	5	4%

E. Who Does Organized Research?

Used Regularly by You	54	40%
Not Available on Campus	17	13%
Used on Special Occasions	40	30%
Available but Seldom Used	19	14%
No Response	7	5%

F. Are Faculty Involved in Student Services?

Used Regularly by You	89	66%
Not Available on Campus	3	2%
Used on Special Occasions	33	24%
Available but Seldom Used	11	8%
No Response	1	1%

G. How Much Extension Teaching does your Faculty do?

Used Regularly by You	64	47%
Not Available on Campus	15	11%
Used on Special Occasions	36	27%
Available but Seldom Used	14	10%
No Response	8	6%

2. Differences in Faculty Load by Academic Rank:

A. What is the Average Credit Hour Production by Rank?

Used Regularly by You	39	29%
Not Available on Campus	44	33%
Used on Special Occasions	21	16%
Available but Seldom Used	26	19%
No Response	6	4%

B. What is the Student Credit Hour Load by Rank?

Used Regularly by You	37	27%
Not Available on Campus	44	33%
Used on Special Occasions	26	19%
Available but Seldom Used	23	17%
No Response	6	4%

Do you have Instructional Quality Evaluations?

Yes	94	70%
No	38	28%
No Response	3	2%

If yes, do you review the results of these evaluations?

Yes	68	50%
No	26	19%
No Response	41	31%

If not reviewed by you, by whom are they reviewed?

Review Committees	8	6%
Administration	37	27%
Students	2	1%
Faculty	3	2%
No Response	85	63%

Are the evaluations reviewed for purposes of determining salary increases?

Yes	73	54%
No	20	15%
No Response	42	31%

By Whom are your Faculty Studies conducted?

Academic Administration	81	60%
Committees - Faculty	10	7%
Research Office	13	9%
Executive Administration	5	4%
Students	2	1%
Others	4	3%
No Response	20	15%

How do you decide, or what studies do you generally use, in making policy decisions about:

1. Faculty Load:

Recom. of Administration	37	27%
State Formula, Board of Trustees, etc.	25	19%
Faculty Load Studies	22	16%
Other	31	23%
No Response	20	15%

2. Changes in Curriculum:

Recom. of Administration	25	19%
Demands of Career World	7	5%
Committee recommendations	52	39%
Department recommendations	8	6%
Analysis of Research Data	18	13%
State Control	8	6%
Faculty Senate	6	4%
Other	7	5%

3. Adding Additional Instructional Space:

Faculty recommendations (VPAA, Deans, Committees)	33	25%
Executive Administration	14	10%
Research Office or Space Office	12	9%
Statewide Planning Formula	20	15%
Space Analysis Data	26	19%
Other	12	9%
No Response	18	13%

4. Allocating Faculty Positions to Various Departments:

Recom. of Administration	59	44%
State Formula, Board of Trustees Formula, etc.	6	4%
Faculty Load Studies	40	30%
Other	15	11%
No Response	15	11%

5. Do you communicate the results of research reports to your general faculty regarding:

A. Budget Studies:

Regularly	42	31%
Occasionally	71	53%
Not Recently	15	11%
No Response	7	5%

B. Student Studies:

Regularly	59	44%
Occasionally	64	47%
Not Recently	2	1%
No Response	10	8%

C. Curriculum Studies:

Regularly	82	61%
Occasionally	41	30%
Not Recently	5	4%
No Response	7	5%

D. Faculty Studies:

Regularly	61	45%
Occasionally	59	44%
Not Recently	5	4%
No Response	10	7%

E. Long-Range Studies:

Regularly	61	45%
Occasionally	56	42%
Not Recently	8	6%
No Response	10	7%

Do you really find regular ongoing studies very helpful, or do you generally request a particular study for a particular problem?

Ongoing Studies	29	21%
Particular Study	31	23%
Both	45	33%
Other	9	7%
No Response	21	16%

Appendix B. Cover Letter

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE OF PITTSBURG
PITTSBURG, KANSAS

OFFICE OF
THE PRESIDENT

March 10, 1969

My Fellow Presidents: (to paraphrase LBJ!)

I never thought I would contribute to the burden of my colleagues by asking that a questionnaire be completed. Especially I did not think I would take advantage of the fact that you elected me President of AASCU to urge you to complete and return the questionnaire "at your earliest convenience". (To use the popular euphemism meaning the day before yesterday). But here goes.

The questionnaire enclosed herewith was prepared by Dr. Wesley J. Sandness, Director of Institutional Research at Kansas State College of Pittsburg, and this year an Administrative Fellow selected for the program of the American Council on Education. As a Fellow in the American Council program, Dr. Sandness has to prepare a research paper. I posed the question to him that is now the subject of his inquiry. That question is: "What kinds of information do college Presidents find most useful in making administrative decisions?"

The questionnaire is not simple. It will take at least a half hour of your time. And it will require some thought. (And before you say it, let me say it: Maybe the whole idea is of doubtful value.) None the less I solicit your help. Would you please complete and return the questionnaire as soon as possible - but certainly not later than April 1.

If anything comes of this project I will see that you get a copy of the report or article or whatever - Free.

Thank you very much.

Cordially yours,

George

George F. Budd
President

GFB:ds

P.S. This project has been cleared with the Committee on Studies of AASCU.

END 1-15-70